

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

AUG 14 1943

Volume III, No. 14

August 9, 1943

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

Educational and Religious Barrenness

DURING the past two months the present writer has been privileged to visit Britain and to speak to many groups, religious and secular. During the course of the visit, one week was devoted to a tour of British Army camps, conferring with educational officers in the afternoon and speaking to the troops in the evening.

This particular week produced one of the most striking impressions of the entire visit to Britain. For the British Army has a remarkable educational program, while our own army has no program at all. In the British Army there are educational officers in every unit and the educational service heads-up in the war department itself. Splendid pamphlet material is prepared to encourage discussion by soldiers of the moral political problems and purposes of this war. There is also an Army Bureau of Current Affairs and a semi-official group of university leaders, the "Central Advisory Council for Adult Education in H. M. Forces." In addition the Y.M.C.A. has a splendid educational service and many nicely appointed centers where men can come, away from camp environment, to give themselves to study and discussion.

The educational program in the British Army is a genuine contribution to the democratic cause, because it encourages the men to think significantly about the causes and consequences of this war. In addition it encourages small groups to develop any special cultural or artistic interests which they may have. In comparison with such a program our army is almost completely devoid of any educational service. The men are well taken care of in their very nice clubs scattered over Britain. They do not lack "entertainment." Diligent hostesses arrange dances for them and theatricals of all kinds beguile their leisure. But there is nothing in the army to encourage the thoughtful soldier to a serious consideration of the meaning of the conflict in which he is involved. The boredom of long winter nights is not relieved by a genuine cultural program.

The lack of any educational program in the army is aggravated by the fact that the non-military agencies such as the U.S.O. in this country and the Red Cross on the other side have only the most desultory educational program. The army is held

together purely by military discipline and not by a cultivation of the democratic substance of the civilization which the army presumably represents.

On the religious side we have of course many good chaplains who are doing splendid work. But on the other hand only the most resourceful chaplains are able to reach their men effectively. The chaplains do not have (as far as we know) such institutes as those in which British chaplains exchange experiences and learn from more experienced men. The army is content to teach them the proper way of becoming a part of the army organization. Some denominations give their chaplains helpful material. But on the whole they do an isolated job. Our American chaplains do not have such an institution as the "Padre's Hour" in which the British chaplains meet the troops informally for discussions and in which they usually accomplish more than in the more formal services.

The consequence of this cultural, political and religious barrenness in the American Army is accurately described in a letter which we have just received in our office from an American soldier. He writes: "In general the army viewpoint is pathetically low and life in the army is mean and barren."

On the political side the cultural barrenness of our army is dangerous. It produces cynicism and a sense of futility and frustration. Soldiers who are discouraged from participating in serious discussions of the great moral and political issues which face us are tempted to those moods which are the soil of fascist politics. "Their's not to reason why, their's but to do and die" is a pathetic slogan for a democratic army.

On the religious side the merely formal services which the chaplains conduct are not sufficient opportunity to make religion meaningful in the context of army life. We do not deny that resourceful chaplains are able to overcome these handicaps and exercise a significant ministry to their men. But men of great resource are always few. In this connection it might be observed that it was rather strange that the religious forces in this country capitulated so easily to the complete secularization of the non-military services to the army. The Y.M.

C.A. in the last war, made older and more experienced religious leadership available to both the chaplains and the troops. The British are doing that now with great success. Meanwhile we have no service of that kind. There are occasional forms of it in certain camps. But on the whole the American Army is bereft of any ministry from either the educators or the civilian religious leaders.

It may be too late to develop these services in our army. It could only be done by a complete change of policy and not by incidental concessions here and there. The responsibility for this state of affairs probably rests upon the custodians of the cultural and religious resources of our nation more than upon the army itself. It is, in any event, a very serious situation.

R. N.

The Future of Christianity in Japan

THOBURN T. BRUMBAUGH

WHAT happens in Japan in the years ahead is as problematic as post-war Russo-American relations. And yet, since certain alternatives are clear, let us consider briefly what may be the future of Christianity in Japan following this war.

The first, though perhaps the most unlikely, possibility is that our Christian faith may find itself obliged to live in a framework of Axis victory and world domination. In such a circumstance the Japanese would of course be the masters of Asia and Christianity in Japan would find itself an almost infinitesimal minority movement in a land devoted to pagan and imperialistic designs at home and abroad.

It is this possibility which frightens many; for they assume that even the opportunity of living and working for Christ depends upon a victory for our own nation and its allies. Sometimes when resolutions to that effect have been hastily adopted in nationwide religious convention, Christians realize on second thought that the Infinite cannot and must not be so circumscribed and that God has never been without witness among any people.

Christianity is a small but influential force in Japan's life and Christians are to be found in almost all strata of Japanese society. Just as in Europe and the Americas, there are Christians even in the Japanese Army and Navy, men who are personally of high moral character and who, like many of our own Christian admirals and generals, find the ideal for military careers in the Bible. Japanese Christianity may be a pitifully regimented and emasculated copy of what the Sermon on the Mount envisions. Yet the Christian Church, Catholic and Protestant, is a definite factor in Japan's present day life and the situation in which it finds itself stifled by non-Christian and anti-Christian elements is not too dissimilar from the same conditions existing in our own Western lands at various times in our history.

Conceivably, therefore, Christianity in a victorious Japan would be to a large degree an instrument of the state, used for state purposes to reinforce national

morale with consistent moral principles—a handmaiden of the political order as religion has so often been obliged to be in the complexities of personal and social existence. It would still, however, be a leaven. Insofar as Christianity were a strong factor in the occupied areas of China and Southern Asia, Japanese Christians might be expected to establish a degree of liaison and cooperation therewith. Today as always, religious enthusiasms and even the official representatives of the Christian faith are being exploited as an adjunct of military conquest and political aggression, their function being to assist in the pacification and if possible the conversion of the vanquished. The only justifying rationalization of this is that eventually the Christian spirit and ethic will outlive its pagan wrappings and bring both victors and vanquished to a higher level of civilization. In the meantime it may be assumed that the Christian Japanese would be doing everything possible to humanize the relations of their nation's aggressive vanguard with the peoples encountered in the program of exploitation, upon which a victorious Japan would undoubtedly embark. This would be so nearly a replica of what Great Britain, France, Holland and other Christian imperialists have been creating for their own satisfaction in Asia and elsewhere that perhaps we may be forgiven for the notion that God may be intentionally holding the mirror of history before the shocked conscience of Christendom.

The second alternative possibility is that Japan will be completely vanquished and crushed, politically, socially and economically, by the forces arrayed against her in the present conflict. What then will become of Christianity in the archipelago? In that event it may be that bitterness would be so great in the Japanese breast as to almost destroy all belief in and regard for Christianity, even among those who have been its ardent adherents.

This would leave for Christians of the victorious nations only the opportunity for relief and rehabili-

tation, a prospect which might appeal greatly to certain home churches and would-be missionaries. It is unlikely, however, that any except the poorest and lowest in Japan would accept such charity, and the result would be little better than the creation of an unpromising crowd of "rice Christians" such as those upon which the Church has been obliged to build its hopes for the future in certain other lands where indoctrination of the higher social strata has been difficult.

This would be but a recapitulation of the general history of conquest and subjugation. The only possible difference in the results of a crushing Japanese victory over China and an Anglo-American vanquishment of Japan would be of degree rather than of kind. Aside from the possibility of mitigating the direst evils of such an outcome of the war, it must be recognized that Christianity as such cannot survive many more such experiences; for the plane of human relations is thereby degraded to a level where Christian motivation is supplanted by the primitive passions of survival and revenge. In such a post-war world it is altogether likely that embittered Japan, like disillusioned Germany following World War I, would set about systematically to seek recruits in China, India, Burma and throughout Southeastern Asia for the next test of strength against white, "Christian" and so-called democratic imperialism, and World War III would indeed be just around the corner.

A third and more hopeful prospect is conditioned on the possibility of an honorable conclusion of the war in which we are now engaged, a complete discrediting of militarism among both Axis powers and United Nations, and a peace negotiated on premises of justice and world unity. Increasingly the conditions making for global war demand the solution of a fundamental global coordination and cooperation. This is also true in the realm of religion, as may be seen in the progress of the ecumenical movement among Christians, and even among Buddhists and Hindus, both within nations and internationally in recent years. Such a disposition expressed openly and consistently throughout the war on the part of American and British Christians, and thereby determining the course of both the war and the peace, cannot but have its effect upon the future of Christianity in Germany, Italy and Japan, as well as in other parts of Europe, Asia and Africa.

Having been in Japan as the inevitability of war with Britain and America became even more obvious, I can testify to the conviction of many Christian Japanese that such an issue would be the only outcome conducive to Christian interests in Japan and East Asia. There can be no denying that many Japanese Christians and other internationally minded people in Japan are ready to identify themselves and their nation with a world order of planned peace and

justice. Evidence of this is seen in the fact that Japan, while governed by her liberally minded leaders, officially related herself to the League of Nations for fifteen years and cooperated fully in all of its activities. In many other political, social and even economic aspects of the world's life during the past quarter century the Japanese have shown themselves capable and worthy of a large place in the fabric of global interrelatedness. In religion as well, and especially as represented by Japanese Christians who have attended conferences in this country and throughout the world, Japan has exhibited a leadership which will not only be influential in the inner life of Japan for years to come but has much to offer for the enrichment of the world's religious culture.

Very much therefore depends upon two inter-related issues in this war: the discrediting of the nationalistic mood which seeks to solve problems by forceful imposition on others, and the growing conviction in the world that only by voluntary and hearty cooperation can any and all nations live profitably in our shrinking world.

Something has been reported in this country of the recent decision of Japan's newly united Protestant Church, which now represents two-thirds of the Christians in the land, to regard itself as but a branch of the world-wide Christian movement. This is just as definitely the disposition of the Roman and Greek Catholics in Japan, and of many Buddhists and those of other enlightened and idealistically inclined groups as well. A sequence, if not a consequence, of impending war and then of war itself is that Japan now has a well integrated and mature Christian movement, small but influential, made up largely of middle class members but holding high place in public esteem, and possessed of fine churches, schools and social institutions, all administered and supported—though perhaps not adequately—by the Japanese themselves.

All this may, under propitious post-war conditions, be integrated in genuinely ecumenical fashion with the world's rapidly developing unity and inter-relatedness. It may not be possible or desirable to return to the days of large support from American and other mission agencies. Doubtless, however, there will be opportunities for our help in many types of Christian service, though without the element of domination heretofore accompanying such aid.

It is doubtful whether the Japanese Church will ever again of its own volition welcome foreign missionaries in large numbers as heretofore. In the first place, it has been increasingly evident that the Japanese are as qualified as any foreigners for leadership in the usual types of Christian service. Also, pride is a potent factor in the life of nations and will continue to be so until nationalism is largely subordinated to universal welfare. One consequence of national pride at the present level of world culture

is the conviction that missionaries and other such cultural representatives should be exchanged rather than merely sent in one direction as in the heydays of imperialism.

There will surely be a need in Japan for American and other representatives of the Christian faith and fellowship. In the future they may well be specialists in certain ministries of Christian advance rather than the older type of general evangelical missionaries. They will probably serve for shorter terms of service. But in any decent post-war world we shall be dealing with a mature and unified Christian movement in Japan. If we in America are thinking in missionary categories at all, this demands a similarly unified,

articulate and united Christian front here at home. Though beset by many adversaries and vicissitudes, we of the Christian Church are at the threshold of a more united and, indeed, a more brotherly world order. Slowly but surely the Japanese Christians have been preparing their own household of faith for admission to that universal family of peoples and nations. Whether as nations we are ready for that next and ultimately inevitable step is debatable; but obviously the Christian churches of America should be moving in that direction. Increasing Christian unity abroad demands at least a commensurate degree of ecumenicity among those who would send missionaries to bring the world to Christ.

The War As the Gospel's Opportunity

H. NORMAN SIBLEY

THE war is a manifestation of man's corporate failure and sinfulness. But it is also an opportunity for the Gospel to be known with power. The early "jitteriness" of religion has passed, when it faced the uncertainties of war itself, wondering if its faith would be adequate. The tragedy is with us still; but the goodness of God is also. And the Church is aware of certain new opportunities for faith which the war has revealed. God uses even the wrath of men to praise Him. He is here in spite of the war, active in history, as the prophets of old saw Him and knew Him. Indeed with all soberness it may be said that *because* of the war, as not before, He is being seen and known.

In a book of prayers published in the early days of the war there appeared this sentence, "This war will produce another generation of sceptics as regards the practicality of taking Jesus seriously." Of course the data for an estimate are not yet all in. As a parish minister, however, I do not find the signs of such a scepticism among the Christian people I meet. On the contrary, there is a general sense that our only hope lies in a return to religion. In general people are not saying, with the deep cynicism I knew as a young person in the last war, "Can there be a good God if such things as this war can happen?" The effect seems rather to have been that the war has revealed us to ourselves and we are ashamed. Young people are asking basic questions concerning the validity of Christian standards in times like these. But they do so naturally, confronted thus suddenly with the question of life itself. They do not do so cynically, and they respond to the presentation of the high calling that is in Christ Jesus to meet these times.

The war then is showing us in crisis what we had forgotten is perennial in man—his moral inadequacy.

The war is the result of the years that preceded it. The seeds were already planted in the pre-war society which we had created. The war has shown us that to which we had become blind, that even normal man is sinful.

Is not God hereby destroying the great heresy of our times? He is knocking out the legs of our false spiritual self-sufficiency. (The destruction began, perhaps, in the thirties in our economic disaster.) Modern man is a creature of immense pride. The sense of moral inadequacy has disappeared almost wholly from our knowledge of ourselves. The world industrial expansion of recent generations has given us a false sense of our abilities. These abilities extend not only into the material world where modernism has produced such wonders; we assume their application also to the moral world. We are different creatures than past generations. We thought the modern use of reason, applied to all problems, would abolish social difficulties between nations and classes. This false optimism concerning our natures shut out all sense of moral inadequacy and need. It therefore shut out the good news of the Gospel. For if there is no need, there is also no Saviour. And our pulpits have unconsciously accommodated themselves to this modern heresy by the increased preaching of Jesus as Example to the neglect of Jesus as Redeemer. The first and greatest opportunity which the war gives to the Gospel is that it is revealing to us the true nature of ourselves. It is doing so with shocking reality. God can do nothing with us until we see our need and our creaturehood and turn to that true self that is in Him.

There is a second opportunity growing out of this primary possibility of re-appraisal—that we may be able to develop a more solid approach to human problems, including those of the war and post-war

period. In the last war, we were led by two simple appraisals: on the one hand a naive idealism, and on the other a quick despair when that idealism failed to materialize in political fact.

Surely one of the critical questions at the close of this war will be whether our church people will be largely motivated again by simple idealism and will reject any bases for peace which are not in full accord with the preconceived ideal, or whether they will have greater spiritual patience to wrestle with the continuing complexities of human life.

Man belongs not only to the paradise of the Garden of Eden; he belongs also to the Fall. The middle way between naive idealism and despair must be found for dealing with life, so that God's salvation may reach it. Is not this also the good news of our faith?

Another opportunity which the war can give us is a new realization of the fundamental place of religion in life. How absent are any unifying view of the universe and any common motivation toward social responsibility. Nazism is a brilliant and logical expression of the final implications of such a secularism. A man is the supreme arbiter over life for his fellow man. Is God not using the war to press us back toward the truth that is in Him? How can we be sure that the major powers among the United Nations which will become the necessary new centers of authority after the war, if victorious, will not become new centers of imperialism? The vitalities that exist in democracy are our best immediate guarantee. But is not our final security a wide-spread sense of reverent awe for the God who exacts justice and mutual responsibility as the price of stability? There is some evidence within and without the Church that God is being listened to with new respect in this regard. Certainly the Church is eager to see that already He has given it an ecumenical fellowship crossing racial, national and class lines, which is the society in miniature for which the world longs.

Yet another door which the war is forcing open is the uses God has of suffering in His economy. Perhaps we have seen the possibilities for good which He can bring out of suffering. This is yet more, however: that we learn some things by suffering which evidently God can teach us in no other way. Was there any possibility of our seeing our responsibility to the world as the leading industrial power, and overcoming our historical isolationism than by being thrust into some such fearful jeopardy as is this war? Creatures of the flesh, we are slow to accept our responsibilities until our very flesh is struck.

Could Protestant and Catholic Christianity in England and in France have reached even their present recognition of one another except they had been stripped of all lesser securities than the Christ

that remains to each? Certainly we are centuries from any such recognition in this unbombed land.

Is Isaiah's God speaking with new immediacy, "O Assyria, the rod of mine anger?" Is He using the war to break up our false belief in success, to show us that faithfulness in all that life brings is our one goal, and not the absence of pain? Is He trying to show us, by the demands which victory puts upon us, that stability in society is dependent upon a recognition of the common man?

Not surprisingly, a new knowledge of the privilege of giving ourselves away is also among the war's revelations to many people. It is a spiritual discovery of the first order for men of our day to learn that they are expendable. Our emphasis on individualism, economic predatoriness, the necessity of success, prudence and safety-first, has shut many doors to the joys to which the Gospel of Our Lord can introduce us. They have dulled our moral sensitivity also to cruelty, the sufferings of others, the monstrosity of fascism. There is still plenty of "grousing," of social indifference, of ignorance as to what is at stake now and in the peace, of "chiseling" even. But also there are many who are finding a new sense of meaning for themselves because they are expending themselves. The men in service whom I know have this sense of purpose and dedication. And it is without any cheap sense of vengeance thus far, at times combining also with an active Christian critical quality. What is true of our young men in service is true also of folk at home. One does not need to bless the sin that is war to say that the faith in One who gave himself on Cavalry is more possible and understandable now than in our years of "normalcy."

I have written here of some of the opportunities for a new vision of God which the war has created. They are, of course, opportunities, not accomplishments. But also they emerge out of a parish ministry from contact with people. Our moralistic preachings have made it all but impossible for us to find any good in so tragic a happening as war. But let no one who shares our Bible's knowledge of the God who works in history miss the certainty that He desires to come to us with new power in the very midst of these fiery trials.

Authors in This Issue

Thoburn T. Brumbaugh was formerly a missionary in Japan and is now the Executive Secretary of the Detroit Council of Churches.

H. Norman Sibley is the minister of the University Heights Presbyterian Church, New York City.

Wilbert B. Smith is Candidate Secretary of the International Board of the Y.M.C.A. Mr. Smith was formerly the Senior Secretary of the Egyptian Y.M.C.A., Cairo, Egypt.

The Arab Problem Is a Christian Problem

EDITOR'S NOTE: Our issue of June 28th contained an article by Dr. Henry A. Atkinson on "The Jewish Problem Is a Christian Problem." We publish herewith a discussion of the Palestinian question from another point of view. It is our intention to present other interpretations in subsequent issues.

Dr. Atkinson's article "The Jewish Problem Is a Christian Problem" raises serious questions. I have lived in Egypt since 1921 and have been in intimate contact with Palestine as well through the years, working with Arabs, Jews, Christians of the country, and British people. There is very much I do not know about their problems, but I am aware of some of the difficulties inherent in the proposals made to make Palestine a Jewish state in which the Arabs will become a tolerated minority.

Is it correct to say that "only in so-called Christian countries does anti-Semitism exist and create this tragic situation"? For years past there has been a rising tide of anti-Zionism in Egypt. The Arabic press has been full of it and the minds of Egyptians, both Christian and Moslem, have been flooded with growing distrust and dislike of the Jew because of Zionism's program of subordinating the Arab to a minority status. This is also true across North Africa and Arabia.

While it is true that the Jews "have an ancient moral claim to Palestine" it is also true that the Arabs have a similar claim plus centuries of actual residence. One seldom hears this claim presented or mentioned, in America, but throughout the Near East it is asserted constantly.

Why should "joint action of the United Nations" impose the Jewish refugees upon the Arab majority of Palestine—simply because they have the power to do so? Other nations, like the United States, Canada, South Africa, could well afford space and opportunity for them, but their people refuse permission and will not be coerced into accepting them. Since the Arabs are unable to resist they must be compelled—in the name of "preserving and extending democracy"!

If the Christian Council on Palestine were to direct their efforts to creating a welcome in the United States for these persecuted people, might it not be a more Christian as well as a more democratic procedure? What facts justify the assumption that, although unwanted and unwelcome in this country, these Jewish sufferers would "especially through the influx of refugees from war-torn Europe, not only increase the potential resources of the land but benefit both Jew and Arab alike"? Are the Moslem Arabs so much more spiritually capable than American Christians of living with people they look upon as invading their country and overturning their dominant position?

Granted that the Jewish immigration in Palestine has brought benefits to the Arabs, it has also threatened what most Americans think of as a priceless value, namely, the right to live their lives in their own way in the land of their fathers.

One may question the statement that "the Arab has ample opportunity for self-determination in many lands, but that the Jewish people have no such hope except in

Palestine." In what lands has the Arab such opportunity except in Jedjaz and Yemen? In Iraq, perhaps, although British influence there is admittedly very strong.

Why should a Jewish state be set up anywhere at a time when racial and religious sectarianism is contrary to the new spirit of world brotherhood?

Is there much of anything in the experience of the past 25 years in Palestine to justify the hope of the Arabs being accorded "every possible guarantee to participate freely in the political life of the land and granted full cultural and social autonomy"? Have the Zionists specifically shared their cultural and social advantages? If I am not mistaken there was strong opposition to the stand taken through the years by Dr. Magnes, President of the Hebrew University, who sought just such mutuality. Are the Jews from Europe likely to bring with them any tradition or experience of such cooperative living with people outside their own circle?

One agrees that "Britain is wrong in assuming that Palestine is simply her colonial problem. It is a world issue and can be settled only by joint action of the United Nations." But, is the Arab problem solely a Palestinian question, or is it not rather a world issue because of the religious ties between Arabs and all other Moslem peoples? The British know more of that reality than we do because they have to live with it in India as well as in the Near East.

Two hundred and fifty million Moslems throughout the East are becoming increasingly aware of the Zionist Movement and the support it has from so-called Christian governments. They certainly do not look upon it as a part "of the whole process of preserving and extending democracy" but rather as the use of power to impose a program they do not like upon a weak section of their Moslem community. They believe that Zionism is supported by Britain and America under pressure from powerful Jewish interests, and in order to shift the burden of the tragic suffering of Jews in Europe from Christendom, where the suffering has been imposed, to a weak and politically helpless Arab group in Palestine which has not been responsible in any way for that suffering.

World peace plans cannot safely ignore the Moslem world. American Christians have responsibilities to those people no less than to the Jews, to demonstrate Christian principles in relationships between groups as well as between individuals. The long history of misunderstanding and antagonism between Christian and Moslem needs understanding, and the attitudes of Christians need Christianizing if cooperation and not conflict is to govern their relations in the future. The Moslem Arabs need to be shown that in the sight of Christians their rights, needs and interests are as sacred and inviolable as those of the Jews, and action on their behalf is equally desirable in the direction of removing their disabilities. They, too, are poor, illiterate, exploited. For American Christians to ignore them, or to subordinate them to a Zionist group which frankly intends to dominate them for the benefit of the Jews, is to give the Moslem world a false idea of both Christianity and democracy. The Jewish problem is European; to

the Moslem that means it is the responsibility of Christendom. For Christians to shift that burden from their own to Arab shoulders is unjust, judged by either Moslem or Christian standards. And the Moslems know full well that the reason for such action is not simply sympathy for the Jews but also because Western Christendom, especially North America, desires to be free from adding to its own Jewish population by letting Jewish immigrants from Europe who would affect American standards of living and comfort. They will be given to understand, if the new Council proceeds as indicated, that Christendom intends to use its power to protect itself at the cost of the Arab who is in no way responsible for the situation. That way lies loss of confidence in Christian integrity and fairness at a time when it is of the utmost importance to world cooperation and peace.

Why is Palestine the only solution? In spite of the appeal of its Holy tradition and sacred places, are there many European Jews who would not honestly prefer to come to America if given a chance as fair as that proposed for them in Palestine? Would American Jews give less money to finance such a move? Surely there are areas larger than Palestine and not now adequately exploited in which a Jewish state on the American pattern, a part of the United States, might be established.

It seems to me that the Christian Council on Palestine might do two things. The terrible sufferings of the Jews must be remedied and promptly, but not by a procedure undemocratic, and at variance with a Christian sense of responsibility. In the first place, the Council might present to the American churches a fair and adequate picture of the Arab's position and point

of view, with the implication as a world problem ultimately affecting this country as part of the new world order.

Secondly, the Council might urge upon the American people the Christian virtue of hospitality to persecuted peoples; of acknowledging its due share in the Jewish problem growing out of un-Christian conduct towards the Jews in Christendom; and of using some of its wealth, its undeveloped spaces, and its capacity for co-operative helpfulness, to make a home for these refugees among a Christian people dedicated to "the right of men to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." It is written "They that are strong ought to bear the burdens of the weak." The Council seems to be insisting that the weak Arab bear the burden created by the strong Western nations.

"The Christian conscience cannot rest content in expressions of goodwill and pious intentions but must be translated into a definite program of action" writes Dr. Atkinson. True, but can the conscience be "Christian" that imposes burdens on people less able to bear them, unwilling to accept them, and resentful at the effort? Can it be "Christian" to refuse to accept our responsibility for failing to help mitigate the European situation, or to create an atmosphere in our own country in which persecuted Jews might be welcome? It looks like a proposal to put our sins of omission and commission onto the back of the Arab, then to drive him into the wilderness of Arabia in order that our American standards of comfort and social life, of freedom, may be kept uncontaminated by these needy suffering European Jews.

WILBERT B. SMITH.

The World Church: News and Notes

Food for Occupied Countries Urgently Needed

Under the headline, "While the grass grows, the steed starves," the Stockholm newspaper *Svenska Dagbladet* recently called attention to the growing distress in occupied countries. While praising Allied plans for post-war relief, the editorial said: "There is already such a famine in many places that the health of the inhabitants will be seriously threatened for a long time if relief does not come soon—and the war may last a long time yet. The aid that Sweden can extend to these countries is only a drop in the bucket, but Sweden is ready to take care of relief distribution if supplies are sent from overseas. The Allied blockade is the most serious obstacle, the opposition seemingly being strongest in London. There is a fear that such relief will help the enemy, but this has not been the case in Greece (where a Swedish-Swiss Commission of the International Red Cross has been at work for a year), and the longer the war lasts the more the situation in the other countries will resemble that in Greece. The Swedish people hope fervently that these viewpoints will impress the authorities of the United Nations, and that full consideration will be given to the fact that a strict blockade provides excellent enemy propaganda in the occupied countries."

"Speaking the Truth in Love"

This is the title of a pamphlet issued by the British Council of Churches as a call to work for Christian unity. It draws attention to the sense of hindrance in their evangelistic work felt by all churches owing to their divisions, and it suggests that the path towards unity lies in a fellowship of action on agreed matters and in a frank facing of ideas and beliefs which are keeping them apart. It is along this line that real progress has been made by the Faith and Order Movement, now a department of the British Council of Churches. The pamphlet includes a report on varying methods of worship made by a group representing many different churches in an American city (Rochester) which serves as an example to be followed with profit in Great Britain.

Orthodox Bishops Ask Aid

Protesting the silence of German authorities to requests from the Orthodox Church Synod in Berlin for permission to hold services in Russian prisoner camps, Orthodox Bishops in Germany have asked the Ecumenical Council in Geneva to lend it aid.

The bishops say that prison camp services would "give 4,000,000 young Russians religious and Christian

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
601 West 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. McCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

DOROTHY CLEMENS, *Editorial Assistant*

enlightenment and win them back for European Christian culture in preparation for their eventual return to Russia."

Cable Reports

Switzerland: Refugees arriving from France report churches of all confessions continue to help Jews threatened by deportation. Large numbers are hidden and fed.

From August to March, 9,000 refugees arrived in Switzerland from various countries. The Refugee Department of the World Council has given aid to refugees from Italy, Shanghai and France, with funds from Sweden, Switzerland and the United States.

The Ecumenical Commission for Prisoners of War reports a great demand for religious literature from prison camps. In 1942 the Commission sent over 100,000 books including Bibles.

Hungary: A new Ecumenical Commission which will represent all departments of the ecumenical movement is now being formed.

Yugoslavia: A Congress of Orthodox Priests and chaplains in liberated territory protests against the collaboration of certain bishops with the occupation authorities, declares its loyalty to imprisoned Patriarch, and expresses satisfaction in the news that the Church of Russia backs the government in war and sends greeting to the Russian clergy.

France: An illegal Christian magazine with wide circulation just published contains full texts of all declarations made by church leaders against the persecution of Jews. The foreword says Nazi culture is fundamentally anti-Christian. . . . "We want to demonstrate that on

the plane of spirit our duty is to resist and organize resistance to Nazism." "The more Nazism makes its domination felt in France the more clear and firm spiritual resistance must become." Pastors and laymen have been arrested for giving assistance to Jewish refugees. All Christian aid for refugees is threatened but workers are continuing to do their best.

Promises to Suppress Church Opposition

Although last December Hitler conferred upon Mussert the title of "Leader of the Netherlands people," neither he nor his Party has been given any real control over the conduct of Dutch governmental affairs. But Mussert has not yet given up hope, and recently asserted his loyalty to the Fuehrer "until the end of my days." The Amsterdam *Algemeen Handelsblad* quoted Mussert as saying that the "new Netherlands" will have freedom of religion and of conscience concerning really Christian matters, but the political challenge of the churches will be met after the Dutch Nazi Party receives power."

Vituperation of the Dutch Clergy

The funeral of a member of the Dutch Nazi Party—who had been fatally wounded in a fight with two anti-Nazis—served as a springboard for renewed Nazi threats against the Dutch clergy. Deputy Leader Jager accused the clergy of responsibility for the numerous attacks on Nazis and asserted, "we shall avenge terror with terror."

"The underworld is continuously incited by persons who remain in the background," Jager said. "It is a symptom of our times that evil has tried to replace good. Both the clergy and the intellectuals are playing a leading role in these outbreaks; both are incessantly looking for persons willing to assault the best among us. Do not believe that the murderers are the real culprits. Is it, then, true that the church participates in these plots? Is it possible for spiritual fanatics to dispense with the Almighty when He does not give them what they expect?"

Conference Endorses South India Plan

The 24th Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen, Clerical and Lay, gave strong endorsement to the South India plan of Church Union which calls for the merger into one single church of representative bodies from each of the three major Protestant groupings—Anglicans and Methodists, Presbyterians and Reformed, and Congregationalists.

In a statement representing the general opinion of the conference, the church group declared:

"It is the duty of evangelical churchmen to express their full accord with their brethren in South India, who are seeking to heal the divisions which are not of their making, but have come to them from Western Christendom, and to give strong and prayerful support to the scheme of Church union in South India."

Public Library

Woodward & Kirby Aves.

Detroit, Mich.

650 1-44

CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS will suspend publication for the next two issues. The next publication date is September 20th.